



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

have to thank Mr. Paul for a book which, if not profound, has at least the merits of putting great matters clearly, attractively, and simply, of being at once instructive and entertaining.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Philippine Islands.* By JOHN FOREMAN. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pp. xxii, 668.)

PROBABLY no other writer on the Philippines has been so often quoted in the United States since 1898 as John Foreman. Certainly no other has so often been made sponsor for garbled versions of Philippine history and half-truths or downright inaccuracies regarding Philippines and Filipinos.

For a number of years, off and on, Mr. Foreman lived in and travelled about the Philippines in behalf of British manufacturers of machinery for tropical agriculture. Thus he naturally gained expert information about Philippine resources and some general information about the people and their government. Before bringing out his treatise, first in Hong-Kong, then in London, in 1889-1890, he apparently "read up" at random in Philippine history, relying chiefly upon Friar Concepción's tedious and not always reliable chronicles for the early history and on miscellaneous fragmentary writings for the rest—his sources are rarely indicated. With a tendency to launch suppositions as facts where data were wanting, a lack of sympathy with the Spanish viewpoint, ignorance of Spanish history and colonial administration, and prejudice against the friars in the Philippines, the book he produced was a jumble of facts and fancies, of information and misinformation. This as to its historical pretensions; the chapters on agriculture, etc., and on the author's experiences, though by no means devoid of inaccuracies, were more valuable.

Except for a translation of Jagor in 1875, no treatise on the Philippines had appeared in English since Bowring's of 1859. On the strength of the reputation earned by his book, Foreman was summoned to give information and advice to the American peace commission at Paris in 1898—advice which reads very strangely if paralleled with his contributions to periodicals in 1900 and thereafter. While discussion of the Philippine question was at its height in 1899, another edition of Foreman's book of 1890 appeared, with some new chapters giving a very fragmentary and incorrect account of the Tagalog rebellion of 1896-1898. To this account he has in the 1906 edition, under review, made various additions, with inaccuracies as numerous and as glaring as his original errors, which, moreover, for the most part remain uncorrected. There follow some two hundred new pages devoted to a review of the events of American occupation, 1898-1905, and a description of American government, in military and civil phases, and its workings.

Before taking up these new portions of the book, something should be

said, even at this late date, of Foreman's version of Philippine history under the Spanish régime. No real revision of the chapters taken from the previous edition has been made. Practically all the errors of commission and grave sins of omission still stand. Moreover, the author has given us merely a disconnected array of data with no logical correlation. He has had access to none of the contemporary sources for early Spanish-Philippine history, and, strangely for a "Philippine authority", has disregarded entirely the material for the history of the Spanish régime made available since 1898, notably the Blair and Robertson series. Perhaps the best exhibition of his utter lack of preparation is his fourth chapter. For one thing, a writer who passes sweeping judgments on Spain should know more about Spain's colonial organization and its history than does Mr. Foreman. He gives a disjointed and incomplete account of the quarrels between the Spanish civil and ecclesiastical authorities, but neither here nor in his later fragmentary discussion of the religious orders does he touch the really vital questions underlying such conflicts, above all, the episcopal visitation of friar-parishes and the secularization of the parishes. These are matters fundamental to any comprehensive grasp of Philippine history in either the earlier or the closing period of Spanish rule. There is, for example, not even a mention of Archbishop Santa Justa y Rufina and his attempt to secularize the parishes about 1775; the few friar-sources from which Foreman drew chose to ignore or distort this important episode. Foreman's churlish treatment of Anda, one of the great figures of Spanish history in the Philippines, doubtless has this same origin; moreover, his anti-Spanish bias comes out most strongly in his sadly garbled version of the British occupation of Manila and Anda's resistance. Other sections especially imperfect and incomplete are those about the Filipino revolts from the seventeenth century onward, the Chinese in the Philippines, Spain's relations with the Moros, education under the old régime, and "ethnology"—save the mark; there is no more arrant nonsense in the book than the ascribing of a Japanese origin to Igorots and Tagalogs. The chapters (XIII.-XV.) on trade and commerce, revenue and fiscal matters, Spanish administration, etc., contain much useful information not readily available elsewhere in the English language; but they also contain much misinformation, and worst of all are the vital omissions. The Philippine budget of 1888 and other data as to the central and local governments were published in the 1890 edition, and no later information is here given, though changes of many sorts were made before 1898. Like all other writers who have discussed recent Philippine budgets, Foreman does not show that the figures published are only for the central government, and net, while the actual tax-burden was always from thirty-five to fifty per cent. greater.

As to the somewhat revised story of 1896-1898, its account of the "Treaty of Biak-na-bató", which has been most often quoted in support of erroneous statements in the United States, has received some addi-

tions, but its fundamental errors remain. There was no "treaty", though Aguinaldo may have believed so. It is very strange that Mr. Foreman has never seen General Primo de Rivera's *Memoria*, nor other Spanish accounts published since 1898. While in the Philippines in 1904, Mr. Foreman seems to have consulted Pedro Paterno, the "mediator" at Biak-na-bató, and to have taken him very seriously (inserting a ridiculous biography of him on pages 411-413). We are now for the first time given to understand that Mr. Foreman was an intimate of Rizal; still, he gives us an account of Rizal's career that is minus most of the significant data. There is a blunder in almost every line of the account of the siege and capture of Manila; no hint appears to have reached this author that it was virtually surrendered. Just one other illustration of his inaccuracy: he has (p. 471) Admiral Cámara's fleet going to the Philippines in November, 1898, three months after the suspension of hostilities, and in consequence of the threatened rupture between the peace negotiators at Paris!

There ought to be a place for a good review of the American occupation of the Philippines; but Mr. Foreman's new chapters certainly do not fill this gap. Like the rest of the book, the new part has scarcely a page free from important errors (not to mention vital omissions). The author has blithely gone about his task without sifting the mass of data already published, or even reading more than a few of the commoner documents, chosen apparently at random. Instead, he has relied upon miscellaneous information gathered from certain Filipinos in Europe and from Filipino and other residents of Manila, Iloilo, and Sebú during his brief visit in 1904. His informants were often badly chosen (as in the case cited above), much of what he rehearses is mere gossip, part is malicious misinformation, and everywhere one notes lacunae, often of a most startling sort. Just a few of the errors and omissions are noted, and they fittingly characterize the work: No real study is made of the organization and workings of the Malolos government, and such important matters as the contest over religious freedom gets a mere allusion (p. 469), or more commonly no mention at all; the account of Luna's assassination (pp. 500-501) has been furnished by persons ignorant of the facts or interested in distorting them; such an important episode as the "involving campaign" of November, 1899, the flight of Aguinaldo, and the end of the "Filipino Republic" is passed over entirely (!); no mention is made of the provisional civil government (1899-1901) of Negros, which accepted American sovereignty; General J. F. Bell's campaign in Batangas in 1902 is not mentioned; the author has no conception of how peace was brought about in most provinces in 1901—he dates it and the sedition act in 1902, confuses the reports of the two Philippine Commissions, and nowhere describes comprehensively the fundamental legislation of 1901 upon which the present government rests; nowhere, for example, does he tell what are the qualifications for the ballot; he does go into details about the "Bates Treaty" with the

Sultan of Sulu, but he failed to consult the text, and some of his details are wrong; he says nothing of the Pope's Philippine bull of 1902 in his review of the religious question under American government (the best discussion of all he has made under this period, 1898-1905). He has, it should be said, toned down his worst exaggerations and attacks on American rule in his contributions to British reviews in 1900 and 1904, for which he was called to account by Bishop Brent; in some respects, indeed, he is now fairer than any of the other British critics of America in the Philippines. But we are here concerned only with Foreman as a Philippine historian, and as such it is hard to say a good word for him.

The bad arrangement and lack of revision involves much duplication, which the index but poorly remedies. The orthography is sometimes freakish, and Spanish terms are sometimes mistranslated. The statistical tables are very inaccurate in places; the chronological table also, as well as incomplete. The accompanying map is reproduced from a poor and out-of-date Spanish map.

JAMES A. LEROY.

*Skalpieren und ähnliche Kriegsgebräuche in Amerika.* Inaugural Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig, vorgelegt von GEORG FRIEDERICI. (Braunschweig: Druck von Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn. 1906. Pp. 172.)

THIS is one of the most important ethnologic monographs that has appeared in a long time. The author is a young officer in the German army and former attaché of the legation in Washington who, after having already published several shorter Indian studies, presents this as his doctor's thesis for a degree at Leipzig.

The word "scalp" he derives from an old German word akin in form and meaning to "shell". The earliest, and almost the only, notice of the custom in the Old World is that given by Herodotus in connection with the Skythians. The earliest definite notice in America is by Cartier, who in 1535, on the St. Lawrence, was shown five scalps dried and stretched upon hoops. In the same region in 1603 Champlain witnessed a scalp-dance in which fresh scalps were carried by the women as they danced. Other pioneer discoverers found the custom in Florida and Virginia.

Contrary to the general impression, our author claims, and proves by authorities and deduction, that the practice of scalping was originally confined to a comparatively limited area in the eastern United States and Canada, extending from Newfoundland to the Gulf and lower Mississippi, and roughly equivalent to the territory held by the Iroquoian and Muskogean tribes and their immediate neighbors. It did not exist in southern New England, Long Island, or New Jersey, or anywhere beyond the St. Lawrence divide, Lake Erie, and the lower Mississippi until after the coming of the whites. Even in the great plains it is of comparatively recent extension, while along the whole